DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 638 95 SP 011 406

AUTHOR DeLuca, Nicholas M.
TITLE Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of CBTE Programs. Vol. 4, Decision Making Process.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Teacher Education Developmental Service.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT 300-76-0034
NOTE 59p.; For related documents, see SP011 401-409 and SP011 542 ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Consortia; *Decision Making; Educational Planning; Institutional Role; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Leadership Styles; *Organizational Effectiveness; Participant Involvement; Participant Satisfaction; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Program Development
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on the decision-making process of institutions of higher education and their consortia as they responded to a New York State Education Department mandate for competency based teacher education programs. The following questions guided the research: (1) Who was involved in making decisions about policy board composition, consortium operating procedures, plan content, and final plan signoff procedures and protocol? (2) What was the nature of individual involvement in the decision processes of the policy board, task groups, and institutions of higher education (IHE)? (3) What were the characteristics of the process in terms of individual participation and influence in decision making, decision-making style of the consortium leader, degree of conflict and amount of time involved in reaching decisions, and pressure to conform to the majority decision? and (4) What was the structure of the decision-making process followed by the consortium? The consortium type of organization for program development seemed to be a workable one, with the majority of participants feeling that the democratic nature of the decision-making process, with an effective feedback system, allowed them to engage in participation to their satisfaction. On the whole, it appeared that size was the crucial factor in the differences among institutions, since smaller IHE's with smaller consortia, tended to receive four-year program registrations more frequently. (MJB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes ev effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (ED EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made f the original.

ED143638

Factors Affecting The Institutional Development of CBTE Programs / vol. 4

Decision Making Process

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Nicholas M. DeLuca

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Teacher Education Developmental Service / John Ether, Director

Spring 1976

State University of New York at Albany

SP011 406

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED143638

Preface

In July 1970, Teacher Corps requested all 5th cycle programs to begin developing Competence-Based Teacher Education programs. In July 1971, Teacher Corps required that all programs funded be competence-based. Since that time, Teacher Corps has been a major force in the development, demonstration and implementation of CBTE.

In 1972, the New York State Board of Regents set, as a goal, the establishment of teacher certification that ensures possession and maintenance of demonstrated competence on the part of teachers. The movement to CBTE in New York State should be completed by 1980.

These two facts come together quite naturally.

"What can be learned from the experiences in New York State as the transition is made? What help can be provided educational leaders in all other parts of the nation as a result of the New York State experience?"

We at the State University of New York at Albany were given the opportunity to attempt a response to those questions. An inter-disciplinary group of faculty and advanced graduate students in the School of Education accepted that responsibility. This volume is one of eight written as a result of that acceptance. Details are given in the Introduction that follows.

SP 011 406

Directing and coordinating this effort has been one of the most exciting experiences of my professional life. Acknowledgements are too extensive to attempt. Suffice it to say that cooperation of faculty, students, people from so many campuses in the State, our support staff, etc. was truly phenomenal.

One exception must be made. Without the herculean efforts and high level talent of Ms. Kathy Cooke, we would still be in formative stages.

It is our hope that we have, indeed, provided information to help educational leaders throughout the nation to judiciously consider CBTE and, if appropriate, to successfully implement that system.

John A. Ether
Professor of Education
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction to the TEDS Research Project . .	1
	History of CBTE in New York State	2
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Purpose	5
	Focus	5
	Population	6
	Sample	6
	Data Collection	8
	Summary	8
II.	Decision Making Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs .	
	Introduction	9
	Research Questions	14
	Characteristics of the Decision Process and the Demographic Variables	30
	Analysis	36

Appendix A
Glossary of Terms

Appendix B
Responding Institutions
Number of Responses by Category
Responses per Institution by Role

Appendix C
Questionnaire

Appendix D
ANOVA Tables for Decision Making Variables

This document consists of material prepared under Contract No. 300-76-0034, National Teacher Corps.

Introduction to the TEDS Research Project

In August 1975 the Teacher Education Developmental Service began a study designed to document the process of program development in teacher training institutions in New York State responding to a statewide mandate for Competence Based Teacher Education. This comprehensive study was completed in July 1976. The efforts of six professors and five research associates from various disciplines in the School of Education were combined to carry out the study. Six reports resulted from the study.

1. "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research."
2. "Process Environment Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
3. "Organizational Change Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
4. "Decision Making Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs.
5. "Leadership Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
6. "Technical Assistance Factors Affecting Institutional." Development of CBTE Programs.

HISTORY OF CBTE IN NEW YORK STATE

During the past forty years much change has taken place in the regulation of teacher preparation and certification practices in New York State. Mandatory requirement of a baccalaureate degree for most public school teachers was established in 1936. In 1943, the fifth year requirement was enacted for secondary and special certificates; in 1963 this was extended to elementary certificates. Certification has been granted by the State to students successfully completing an accredited academic program.

Recently the 1972 New York Board of Regents published "Education Beyond High School; the Regents Tentative Statewide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education". That document cited changes in the economic, cultural and educational sectors of society that necessitated a re-evaluation of teacher preparation programs. The Regents goal for the preparation and practice of professional personnel in the school is:

> To establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the school possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.

The Regents intended this goal to be implemented in Competency Based Teacher Education programs, with the state maintaining ultimate control through its program registration system.

Groundwork toward a competency-based teacher preparation program was laid in 1971 when 12 field-based trial projects dealing with program revision were sanctioned and supported by the New York State Department of Education. The projects included faculty and staff from public schools and colleges and teachers in training who identified school goals, relevant teacher competencies, evidence that such competencies are influentical and training programs to develop those competencies. These trial projects were continued and became models for the institutions now involved in re-writing teacher education programs in a competency-based mode. Other models, including the various Teacher Corps programs, were being developed and tested during the same period.

To implement the goal of state-wide competency based teacher education, a series of regional meetings were held in 1973, outlining new procedures and standards for state certification. A time line for program registration was established, beginning in 1976 for certain elementary certifications, concluding in 1980 with a competency based program for school administrators.

The first round of program submissions was completed in February, 1975. This research report concerns those institutions involved in meeting the February, 1975 deadline.

Statement of the Problem:

What are the processess involved in institutions of higher education and their consortia as they responed to a New York State mandate for CBTE?

The February, 1975 deadline for programs in elementary education, special education of the deaf and blind, and speech-hearing education marked the first mandate change toward Competency-Based Teacher Training in New York State. One hundred and forty-three teacher training programs in sixty institutions were required to respond to this deadline by submitting teacher training programs for program registration to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification. Due to the wide variety of institutional settings and characteristics represented by this group of teacher training institutions, responses to the state mandate took varying forms. Despite these differences in institutional settings and characteristics, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was confronted with the problem of applying and developing standardized criteria upon which to base decisions regarding program registration. It is from these two phenomona; 1) the variations in institutional setting and characteristics, and; 2) the Division's state-wide mandate and standardized criteria for program development and registration, that the problem which this study addresses eminates.

This study concerns itself with the first part of the problem: the process of developing CBTE programs in sixty institutions in New York State with varying institutional settings and differing organizational, social, and physical characteristics.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to: 1) identify, 2) describe, and 3) compare the characteristics (elements or factors) of the process of designing CBTE program proposals in various institutions in New York State as they responded to a state-wide mandate for CBTE.

Focus

The study focused upon those institutions which:

1) were to submit teacher training program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. These include programs for the preparation of teachers in the following subject areas:

   a. N-6
   b. Special Education
   c. 7-9
   d. Speech-Hearing
   e. Deaf
   f. Blind

2) received one-year and/or four-year registration of their program proposals from the State Education Dept., division of Teacher Education and certification,

3) met the creteria set by the researchers regarding institutions, and whether or not they were public or private institutions containing appropriate programs, and,

4) indicated a willingness to participate in the study by allowing administration of questionnaires. It should be noted that the state mandate places Responsibility for program design upon the institutions of higher education. However, the mandate also requires that the institutions design the programs by collaborating with school district personnel and personnel from appropriate professional agencies. This collabortive group is known as the consortium and becomes the focal point for data collection in the study. The consortium also included sub groupings termed the Policy Board and Task Force whose behavior and involvement in the process will be analyzed.

Population

The population for this study consisted of those institutions which were required to submit CBTE program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. Sixty institutions fell into this category encompassing one hundred forty-six teacher training programs. These programs proposed to train elementary school teachers in the following areas:

1. N-6 (81)
2. Speech Hearing (25)
3. 7-9 (6)
4. Deaf (3)
5. Blind (1)
6. SpecialEducation (30)

146

Sample

The researchers assumed that factors of institutional size and whether or not institutions were publicly or privately funded could provide a basis for comparison. Also, two categories were formed on the basis of whether or not institutions received one year or four year registration from the SED. Comparisons are made on the basis of these categories of analysis in each report. The categories formed on the basis of these criteria (size, funding, and registration) follow:

One year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
small	4

Four year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
Small	4

There was an insufficient number of small institutions to categorize them into private or public categories. One category had only four institutions and therefore the decision was made to place four institutions in each category to insure a balanced response from all categories. Initially, institutions to be placed in the remaining categories were chosen to insure the widest possible geographical dispersion throughout the state. Some institutions declined participation in the study. Back-up institutions were also selected on the basis of geographical dispersion and availabliilty.

An additional categroy of institutions was constructed from institutions which submitted two programs which received differing program registration (1 year or 4 year). This was done to provide a comparison of one and four year program development within institutions. This categroy was divided into public and private institutions.

One and four year registration

Public	(4)
Private	(4)

As a result of these categories and the necessity to place four institutions in each category thirty two institutions comprised the sample.

Eighteen of the 32 institutions responded.

Eight individuals at each institutions were identified according to role. These roles were identified in order to allow for a representative sample of all groups involved in the development of the CBTE program. The individuals identified were as follows:

--School of Education Dean or Department Chairman
--Public School Principal on the Policy Board
--Public School Teacher on the Policy Board
--College Faculty Member on the Policy Board
--Task Force Chairman
--Task Force Member from public school
--Task Force Member from college faculty
--Chairman of Policy Board

Each individual described above was given one questionnaire specifically disigned for his role. (For further information see Appendix B)

Data Collection

Due to the complex nature of the data the difficulties in the logistics of data collection, the decision was made to collect data through a questionnaire. Whenever possible (twenty seven of the thirty two institutions) the questionnaire was administered by one of the researchers at a meeting of the individuals filling out the questionnaire. The data gathered was either brought back by the researcher or mailed in by the respondents. Thus, the majority of the data was collected through on-site visitations.

Summary

The information presented in this section of the report is provided to introduce and explain the context and conduct of the comprehensive study. More specific information regarding the entire study is available in Report #1, "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research."

Decision Making Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs

INTRODUCTION

The over all purpose of this research effort was to identify, describe and compare the processes involved in institutions of higher education and their consortia as they responded to the New York State Education Department's Mandate for competency based teacher education program. This particular document focuses upon the decision making processes. The following questions guided the research:

1. Who was involved in making decisions about:
   a. Policy board composition and meetings
   b. Consortium operating procedures
   c. CBTE plan content
   d. Final plan sign off procedures and protocol

2. What was the nature of involvement of individuals in the decision process of the policy board, task groups and institutions of higher education (IHE)?

3. What were the characteristics of the decision making process followed by the consortium in terms of:
   a. individual participation in the process
   b. individual influence on the process
   c. decision making style of the consortium leader
   d. degree of conflict involved in the decision process
   e. amount of time involved in reaching decisions
   f. pressure to conform to the majority decision

4. What was the structure of the decision making process followed by the consortium?

The research was further structured by selected demographic characteristics. It was assumed that the following characteristics were germain to analyzing the phenomena:

a. institutional size (large, small)
b. public or private funding of institution
c. program to be registered (elementary, speech, special education)
d. length of program registrations granted (one or four year)
e. group involved (Policy Board, Task group, Institution of Higher Education)

Sixty-six individuals from 18 institutions provided useable data for this report. Table 1 below shows the sample breakdown.

TABLE 1

Position of Respondents

Position	Frequency	Percent
Dean	13	19.7
Principal Policy Board	11	16.7
Teacher Policy Board	7	10.6
College Faculty Policy Board	7	10.6
Task Chairperson	6	9.1
Public School Task	8	12.1
College Task	8	12.1
Chairperson	6	9.1
TOTAL	66	100.0

The distribution of the respondents in terms of the relevant demographic characteristics is shown in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 below.

TABLE 2

Program Registration and Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
One Year	35	53.0
Four Year	31	47.0
	66	100.0

TABLE 3

Public or Private Institutional Affiliation and Respondents

Institution	Frequency	Percent
Public	13	19.7
Private	53	80.3
	66	100.0

TABLE 4

Institutional Size and Respondents

Size	Frequency	Percent
Large	43	65.2
Small	23	34.8
	66	100.0

TABLE 5

Program Type and Respondents

Program Type	Frequency	Percent
Elementary	56	84.8
Speech	3	4.5
Special Education	7	10.7
	66	100.0

In order to gather data about the decision making processes used by the consortium and their sub-units, a section of the total project questionnaire was devoted to questions about decision making. This section sought first to identify who was involved in making significant decisions. Secondly, it sought to identify the nature of individual participations in the decision making processes. The third purpose was to identify the characteristics of the decision making process. The decision making questionnaire section is contained in Appendix C.

The data generated from the first section of the decision making questionnaire was aggregated and is arrayed in tables and charts in the body of the text and the appendices. The data generated by sections two and three were aggregated and subjected to several statistical treatments notably one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and multiple regression analysis. Those data are reported in the body of the text and supplemented in the appendices.

TABLE VI

DECISIONS: WHO MADE THEM

WHO	Called Policy Board Together		Final Decisions About Composition of Policy Board Were Made By		Decision About Specific Content of CBTE Program Were Made By		Decision About Operating Procedures of Consortium		Decisions Regarding Process for Final Sign Off Were Made By	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. Dean	32	48.5	11	16.7	2	3.0	2	3.0	5	7.6
2. President of College	1	1.5	1	1.5	0	0	1	1.5	0	0
3. Policy Board - Steering Comm.	0	0	6	9.1	10	15.2	15	22.7	11	16.7
4. Consortium Chpr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.5	0	0
5. Task Force	1	1.5	2	3.0	11	16.7	3	4.5	3	4.5
6. Chpr.-Ed Dept.	17	25.8	3	4.5	2	3.0	2	3.0	3	4.5
7. Policy Bd. & Task Force	0	0	0	0	2	3.0	0	0	0	0
8. Coll. Fac. Council	0	0	0	0	3	4.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
9. Consortium	1	1.5	19	28.8	21	31.8	27	40.9	19	28.8
10. IHE	1	1.5	1	1.5	2	3.0	0	0	5	7.6
11. Do not know	7	10.6	11	16.7	8	12.1	9	13.6	10	15.2
12. Dean & Faculty	2	3.0	3	4.5	4	6.1	3	4.5	1	1.5
13. Dean & Superintendent	3	4.5	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. College, Union, School Admin.	0	0	4	6.1	0	0	1	1.5	3	4.5
15. Policy Board & Ed. Dept. Chpr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4.5
16. Trial Project Dir.	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
17. University & School District	0	0	2	3.0	0	0	0	0	1	1.5
18. State Ed. Dept.	0	0	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	66	100	66	100	66	100	66	100	66	100

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

Who was involved in making decisions about:

a. Policy board composition
b. Consortium operating procedures
c. CBTE plan content
d. Final plan sign off procedures and protocol

Who called the policy board together?

Nearly three-quarters (74.3%) of the respondents indicated that the Dean (48.5%) or the Chairperson of the Education Department (25.8%) take the initiative for calling the policy board together for the first time. The Dean of the School of Education or the Department of Education Chairperson was reported to have played a part in this same initial action by 84.9% of the respondents. In regard to who called the first meeting, 10.6% reported that they did not know while 6% listed individuals other than the Dean or Chairperson.

Who made the final decisions about the composition of the policy board?

More than one-quarter of the respondents (28.8%) indicated that the consortium itself made the final decisions about policy board membership. Twenty-one and two-tenths percent of the respondents reported that the Dean of the School of Education or the Dean and the faculty of the School of Education had the final decision. Six and one-tenth percent reported that the final decision was made jointly by the University or College, the unions and school district administrators. Sixteen and

seven-tenths percent of the respondents did not know who made the decisions.

Who made the decisions about the specific content of the CBTE plan?

Thirty-one and eight-tenths percent of the respondents reported that decisions relating to the specific content of the CBTE plan were made by the consortium, while 15.2% of the respondents indicated that these decisions were made by the steering committee of the policy board. Sixteen and seven-tenths percent indicated that the task force group made the final decision about CBTE plan content. Ten and six-tenths percent suggested that plan content decisions were made by the College or University faculty or a combination of the University or College faculty and their Dean. Twelve and one-tenth percent did not know who made the final decisions.

Who made the decisions about the operating procedures to be followed by the consortium?

More than two-fifths (40.9%) of the respondents reported that operating procedure decisions were made by the consortia. More than a fifth (22.7%) reported that such decisions were made by the steering committee of the policy board. Ten and five-tenths percent of the respondents said the operating procedure decisions were made either by the Dean or Chairperson of the Education Department or by the Deans or Chairpersons in conjunction with their faculties. Thirteen and six-tenths percent

indicated that they did not know who made the decision.

Who made the decisions regarding the final sign off procedures and protocol?

Twenty-eight and eight-tenths percent of the respondents indicated that the final sign off procedure and protocol decisions were made by the consortium itself. Sixteen and seven-tenths percent of the respondents said such decisions were made by the policy board steering committees. A total of 22.7% indicated the decision was made by College and University personnel of one type or another. Fifteen and two-tenths percent did not know who made the decisions.

COMMENTS

The initiative for calling the CBTE planning group together was taken by the University or College personnel. Once the consortium was established the University/College personnel decision making role diminished somewhat and the consortium role increased. It is noted that even though a high percentage of the respondents viewed the consortium as the major decision making body, the combination of College and University personnel categories usually equalled the selection percentage of the consortium. One institution's president took a prominent decision making role in the initial stages. One CBTE trial project director assumed major decision making responsibilities in another institution.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

What was the nature of involvement of individuals in the decision making process of the policy board, task groups, and institutions of higher education?

The data to answer this research question was obtained by asking the respondents to answer the following questions:

"I participated in the consortium decision making process by:
a. exchanging information
b. developing solutions to problems
c. selecting solutions to problems
d. implementing solutions to problems
e. evaluating solutions to problems."

Each respondent was asked to indicate whether or not they engaged in any or all of the five activities specified in the questions. The results are reported in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Nature of Participation in Decision Making
% of Response by Group Membership

Participation Mode	Group						Total of all groups	
	Policy Board		Task Force		IHE			
	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %
Exchanging Information	95.8	4.2	100	0.0	92.0	8.0	95.5	4.5
Developing Solutions to Problems	79.2	20.8	70.6	29.4	80.0	20.0	77.3	22.7
Selecting Solutions to Problems	66.7	33.3	64.7	25.3	64.0	36.0	65.2	34.8
Implementing Solutions to Problems	45.8	54.2	52.9	47.1	56.0	44.0	51.5	48.5
Evaluating Solutions to Problems	75.0	25.0	70.6	29.4	52.0	48.0	65.2	34.8

Policy Board N = 24
Task Group N = 17
IHE N = 25
Total N = 66

When viewed from the perspective of the total sample (N=66) a majority of the respondents reported that they engaged in all five participation modes. "Exchanging information" was reportedly engaged in by 95.5% of the respondents. The next most often engaged in activity was "developing solutions to problems" (77.3%). Slightly more than half of the respondents (51.5%) reported that they participated in "implementing solutions to problems."

When viewed from the perspective of the specific consortium groups, a similar basic picture emerges.

A very large percentage of respondents indicated they participated in exchanging information. The percentages reported ranged from 100% for task groups to 92.0% for the IHE respondents. The second most regularly engaged in activity was "developing solutions to problems." Eighty percent of the IHE group reported they participated in this activity. The task group indicated the lowest percentage of participation in this activity (70.6%). Nearly two thirds (66.7%, 64.7% and 64.0%) of the three groups said they participated in "selecting solutions to problems."

"Implementing solutions to problems" as an activity of the respondents received the most varied responses, i.e. a nearly equal number of respondents stated that they did and did not engage in the activity. Fifty-six percent

of the IHE respondents and 52.9% of the Task Group respondents reported that they were involved in implementing solutions to problems. On the other hand, 45.8% of the policy board respondents said they were involved in the implementation activity.

The "evaluating solutions to problems" activity generated the greatest range of response across groups. Seventy five percent of the policy board respondents indicated that they participated in the evaluating solution activity while 52.0% of the IHE respondents reported similarly. Note that 70.6% of the task group members indicated participation in evaluating solutions.

A one way analysis of variance produced a statistically significant difference between large and small institutions (F Ratio = 8.073) regarding participation in the evaluating solution activity (See Table 13 Appendix D).

COMMENTS

When individual participation was viewed in terms of exchanging information, developing, selecting, implementing and evaluating solutions to problems, it can be discovered that a majority of all respondents engaged in all the activities. However, when viewed across consortium sub-groups some differences did emerge. The differences were reflected in the implementing and evaluation activities. Perhaps some of these differences can be accounted for in terms of the

division of labor made to accomplish the CBTE plan development.

It is also noted that with the exception of "exchanging information" at least 20% and in one case 54.2% of the respondents indicated that they did not participate in the activity.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

What were the characteristics of the decision making process followed by the consortium in terms of:

a. individual participation in the process
b. individual influence on the process
c. decision making style of the consortium leader
d. degree of conflict involved in the decision process
e. the amount of time involved in reaching decisions
f. pressure to conform to the majority decision

The data to answer research question three was obtained by asking the participants to respond seven items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 13, see Appendix C) using a five point Likert scale. On the scale 1 represented strongly agree, 5 represented strongly disagree. The responses to the seven items are reported in Table 8.

TABLE 8

CHARACTERISTICS OF DECISION MAKING PROCESS BY DECISION GROUP

Characteristics	$\bar{X}$* Total Group	$\bar{X}$ Policy Board	$\bar{X}$ Task Groups	$\bar{X}$ IHE
1. Decision style - authoritarian	4.6	4.8	4.2	4.7
2. Powerlessness of individual	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6
3. Invited to participate in proc.	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.8
4. Conflict free process	2.6	2.8	3.1	2.2
5. Decision style - democratic	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.6
6. Decisions clearly identified	1.9	2.0	2.1	1.8
7. Decisions made expeditiously	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.3
8. Decision making structure not defined	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1
9. Decision making process was clearly defined	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.4
10. Problems clearly defined	2.1	2.2	1.9	2.3
11. Solutions presented before being evaluated	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.1
12. Hidden agendas were identified	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.8
13. Pressure to conform applied	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.5
14. Much time was spent on group maintenance	4.2	4.5	3.8	4.3
15. Decision rules developed to expedite process	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.3
16. Feedback process existed	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.4
17. Information sources clearly identified	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.3
18. Information Necessary for decision was clearly identified	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.2

*A 5 point Likert Scale was used. 1 represented "strongly agree" and 5 represented "strongly disagree".

In Table 8 the responses to the 18 Likert items are reported in terms of mean scores by consortium sub-groups and for all respondents.

Individual Participation

The data for characteristic three, "invited to participate in the process," suggests that all participants believed that they participated in the decision making process as much as they wished.

Individual Influence on Process

The data for characteristic two, "powerlessness of the individual," was generated by asking participants to respond to the following item:

> "As a member of the consortium I felt I had no power to influence decision that were made."

The mean score for all groups was 4.5 which means they strongly disagreed. Thus, individuals did not believe themselves powerless.

Decision Making Style

Two items were used to generate data regarding decision making style. The items were:

1. The decision making style followed by the consortium could best be characterized as authoritarian

and

5. The decision making style followed by the consortium could best be characterized as democratic.

The data for characteristics one and five, authoritarian style and democratic style respectively, are complementary. The mean score for authoritarian style across all groups was 4.6 or strongly disagree. The mean for the policy board as a group was 4.8 and for the task group 4.2. The mean score for democratic style was 1.6 or strongly agree. Thus the respondents believed that the most typical decision making style was democratic as opposed to authoritarian.

Conflict

The degree of conflict involved in the decision process was ascertained by asking the participants to respond to the following item:

Consortium decisions were usually made without conflict.

The mean score on characteristic four, "conflict free process" for all respondents was 2.6 indicating a tendency toward the agree or positive side of the scale. The task group mean was 3.1 and for the policy board 2.8. The IHE group was somewhat more positive 2.2. On the whole, all respondents felt the decision making process was relatively conflict free.

Time Involved

Characteristic seven, "decisions made expeditiously," was used to discern the amount of time involved in reaching decisions. The specific item was:

Consortium decisions were usually made expeditiously.

The mean score for all respondents was 2.5, indicating agreement rather than disagreement. The task group mean score was 2.7, the IHE group was 2.3. The participants thus felt the consortium decision process was generally expeditious.

Pressure for Conformity

Participants were asked to indicate the degree of pressure for conformity to the group by responding to the following item:

> In the process of making decisions, consortium members were pressured to conform to the majority's decision.

The mean score for all respondents was 4.3 or disagree, the lowest mean score was 4.1 for the task group and the highest mean score was 4.5 for the IHE group. On the whole, the participants felt they were not pressured to conform to majority opinions.

COMMENT

Individuals involved in the CBTE plan development process felt they participated in decision making as much as they wished and that they were able to influence decisions. The decision making process was characterized as democratic rather than authoritarian. On the whole, the decision making process was conflict free and there was little pressure put upon members to conform to a majority position. Most participants felt decisions were made expeditiously.

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

What was the structure of the decision making process followed by the consortium?

The data to answer research question 4 was obtained by asking participants to respond to eleven items (6,8,9,10,11, 12,14,15,16,17,18 in Table 8) See Appendix C for complete questionnaire items. The responses were made on a five point Likert scale, 1 representing strongly agree and 5 representing strongly disagree. The responses to the eleven items are reported in Table 8.

Structure and Process Definition

To discern the degree to which the participants perceived the existence of a defined decision making process and structures, they were asked to respond to the following two items:

The consortium decision making structure was not at all defined

and

The consortium decision making process was clearly defined.

The mean score for all respondents on the first item was 4.0 indicating disagreement with the statement. The mean score across the three groups varied only by 0.1. The mean score for the second item for all respondents was 2.1 or agree. The range of mean scores varied by 0.4 across the groups. The IHE group score was 2.4 indicating a position somewhat less than agree but still on the positive side of the scale. The indication is then that the participants on the whole and on the

average did discern both a defined decision making process and structure.

Decision and Problem Definition

Two items were included to deal with two elements of the structures and process of decision making: problem and decision identification. They were:

> Consortium decisions necessary to the proposal development tasks were clearly identified
>
> and
>
> In the process of making decisions, the problem was usually clearly defined before solution ideas were presented.

With regard to decision identification, the mean score for all respondents was 1.9 or agree. Across the three groups the mean scores ranged from 1.8 to 2.1; all clearly in the agree range. Problem definition scores are similar; the mean score for all respondents was 2.1 or agree. The range across the three groups from 1.9 of the task group to 2.3 for the IHE. Again, all are within the agree range.

The respondents felt that the decisions to be made were identified by the consortium and that problems were defined before solutions were put forth.

Solutions & Evaluation

The participants were asked to respond to the following items:

> In this process of making decisions, all solution ideas were presented before any were evaluated.

The mean score for all participants was 2.2 or agree. The mean scores across the three groups varied only by 0.2. The respondents agreed that all solutions were presented before any were evaluated.

Group Maintenance and Hidden Agendas

Time spent on group maintenance tasks and hidden agendas of group members were investigated. The two items were:

> Consortium members spent more time on maintaining the consortium than on making consortium decisions
>
> and
>
> In the process of making decisions, the decision makers' hidden agendas were usually identified.

The mean score for all respondents on the group maintenance items was 4.2 or disagree. Across the three groups the mean scores varied 0.7. The mean score for task group respondents was 3.8 and for policy board respondents, 4.5. All are clearly on the disagree scale, with the policy board group indicating a stronger disagreement with the statement.

In terms of identifying hidden agendas, the mean score for all respondents was 2.7. The range of scores across the three groups was only 0.2. These scores are to the agree side of the scale.

All of the respondents felt that not much group time was spent on group maintenance tasks. However, there is no clear indication of how respondents felt about hidden agendas being identified.

Information and Information Sources

The participants were asked to respond to two items relating to relevant information and information sources. The items were:

> Before consortium decisions were made, the members clearly identified what the necessary information was to resolve the problem
>
> and
>
> Before consortium decisions were made, members clearly identified who had the necessary information.

The mean score for all respondents regarding the identification of necessary information was 2.2 or agree. The mean scores across groups varied by only 0.3.

The mean score for information sources for all respondents was 2.3 or agree. The mean scores across all three groups varied by 0.2.

All participants felt that necessary information and appropriate information sources were clearly identified.

Decision Rules and Feedback Process

The final two questionnaire items focused on decision rules and the feedback process. The items were:

> Decision rules were developed by the consortium to expedite the decision making process followed by the group
>
> and
>
> The consortium decision making process had a feedback system built into it.

The mean score for all respondents with regard to the existence of decision rules was 2.5. The mean scores across the

three groups ranged from a high of 2.7 for the policy board group to 2.3 for the IHE group. All the scores are on the agree side of the scale. They are, however, closer to the mid point of the scale than they are to the agree points.

The mean score for all respondents with regard to the existence of a feed back mechanism was 2.3 or agree. The scores across the three groups varied only by 0.2. Clearly respondents felt that a feedback mechanism was built into the decision making process.

COMMENT

The participants in the CBTE plan development activity felt that there were clearly defined decision making structures and processes.

The participants felt that both the decisions that had to be made were clearly identified and that information relevant to the decisions and the sources of that information were clearly identified. The decision process involved an ordered approach to problem solving. Problems were identified, solutions developed and tested.

The participants felt that little time was spent on group maintenance tasks and that decision rules and feedback process existed to both expedite the process and to evaluate the process.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DECISION PROCESS AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Each of the eighteen decision process characteristics were related to the five demographic variables. The demographic variables were:

1.	Program registration	- 1 or 4 year
2.	Institutional type	- public or private
3.	Size	- large or small
4.	Program	- elementary, speech, special education
5.	Group	- Policy board, task group, IHE

A one way analysis of variance was performed with the data. The results are arrayed in Table 9.

Statistically significant differences were found for nine of the eighteen decision process characteristics. The complete ANOVA tables and F Ratio are reported in Appendix D. Only those relationships which were significant at the .05 level or greater were reported in Table 9.

Conflict

The degree of conflict present in the consortium decisions process was correlated significantly with program registrations ($P \geq .001$), type of institutions ($P \geq .0284$) and size of institutions ($P \geq .008$). The less conflict present, the greater was the probability of four year registration. Private institutions generally had smaller consortia and experienced less conflict than the larger public institutions.

Decision Style

Authoritarian decision making style was correlated significantly ($P \geq .013$) with respondents by group. The task group respondents indicated their group operated less democratically and more authoritarianly than did the respondents who were members of either the policy board or the IHE.

Decision Identification

Clear identification of decisions to be made (characteristic #6) was correlated significantly with both types of institutions ($P \geq .039$) and size of institution ($P \geq .008$). Small private institutions seemingly were able to more clearly identify necessary decisions.

Problem Definition

Problem definition was correlated significantly with programs being certified ($P \geq .036$). Respondents who were dealing with special education programs reported that problem definition was less clearly done than was reported by respondents who worked with other programs.

Solutions Development

Decision process characteristic #11 was correlated significantly with both types of institutions ($P \geq .030$) and program ($P \geq .048$).

Respondents from public institutions and respondents in special education programs reported more often than did the respondents in private institutions or in the other two programs, that all solutions were not presented before they were evaluated.

Pressure for Conformity

Decision process characteristic #13, pressure to conform, was correlated significantly with type of institutions ($P \geq .041$). The respondents in public institutions reported more pressure to conform than did their colleagues in the private institutions.

Group Maintenance Time

Decision process characteristic #14, time spent on group maintenance was correlated significantly with type of institutions ($P \geq .008$). Respondents from public institutions reported

spending more time on group maintenance tasks than did respondents from private institutions.

Information Identity and Source

Decision process characteristics 17 and 18, information sources clearly identified and information necessary for decisions clearly identified were correlated significantly with type of institution ($P \geq .037$), ($P \geq .001$) respectively.

Respondents from public institutions reported that their consortium less clearly identified necessary information and relevant information sources than did respondents from private institutions.

Multiple Regression Analysis

In order to determine which set of variables most strongly related to whether a program received four rather than one year registration, a multiple regression analysis was performed. The results are reported in Table 10.

TABLE 10

Multiple Regression Analysis

Step No.	Variable	R	R^2	Increase in R^2
1	Democratic Decision Style	.2814	.0792	.0792
2	Pressure to conform	.3806	.1448	.0657
3	Invited to participate	.4529	.2052	.0603
4	Feedback process existed	.4803	.2307	.0255
5	Decisions made expeditiously	.4931	.2431	.0124

Five decision process characteristics in combination account for 24.3% of the variance (R^2 = .2431). The characteristics are democratic decision style (R = .2814) which is the single largest predictor; pressure to conform (R = .3806); degree of participation (R = .4529); feedback process existed (R = .4803); and, expeditious decision making (R = .4931).

Democratic decision style accounted for nearly 8% of the variance (.0792). Pressure to conform accounted for more than 6.5% of variance (.0657) and degree of participation accounted for 6% of the variance (.0603). The existence of a feedback mechanism accounted for more than 2.5% of the variance (.0255) and expeditious decision making accounted for 1.2% of the variance. (.0124).

Analysis

The State Education Department mandate was specific in two details: that the teacher training programs be in a competency based format, and that the programs be developed by a cooperative process involving the universities or colleges, the school districts and the teachers' union. Decision making was specifically to be cooperative. An examination of the data indicates that the consortia were formed according to the State Education Department plan. Once the consortia were established they generally made the substantive decisions. The decision making was carried out in a rational, information based manner. Individual members of the consortia felt for the most part that they were free to participate as much as they wished and that they were not pressured to conform to majority wishes. Further, they felt that the decisions to be made were clearly identified before hand and that decision rules and processes existed to facilitate the decision process. Decisions tended to be made expeditiously.

While the above description of the decision making process followed by the consortia is true in general, there were significant differences depending upon such factors as size of institution and type of institution.

Small private institutions were more likely to receive four year program registration than were the larger public institutions. They experienced decision making processes that were generally more open, experienced less conflict, were less

formally structured, and led more democratically than the processes experienced by the larger public institutions. A closer look at the phenomena of size and type of institution is in order.

It is very difficult to isolate size and type of institution. Most of the private colleges were small or at least had small teacher training units. They varied in size from two persons to seven persons. The public institutions on the other hand all tended to be large. They had teacher training staffs ranging from twenty to forty persons. Also, the private institutions tended not to have teacher training as their major program focus. The opposite is true of the public institutions, all of whom at one time were primarily teacher training institutions.

The small private institutions typically had special working relationships with two or three school districts in which they placed their student teachers. The consortia they established then were made up of people who already had established, one would guess, a harmonious working relationship. The public institutions, on the other hand, typically dealt with a large number of public schools and had working relationships which tended to be more formal and structured. When they established consortia, they had to be more inclusive or at least felt they had to be more inclusive. The consortia were thus larger. Initially, the public institution consortia had to spend time establishing working relationships. Also, the larger the consortia the more likely it was that separate task groups

were established, creating in many cases three levels to coordinate. Many of the larger consortia in addition to the policy boards had a steering group or executive committee that was primarily responsible for the management of the CBTE planning process. The smaller private colleges more likely than not had but one level in the consortium. That is, the consortium was both the policy board and the task group. In many of the smaller private colleges the task of actually preparing the CBTE plan was the responsibility of the college faculty members. The consortium simply served as a reviewer of the plan.

The decision making processes in the larger public institutions tended to be characterized by more conflict than was reported in smaller private colleges. This is not surprising given the fact that the larger the consortium the more bureaucratic its management had to be. Also, the faculties in the public colleges and universities were more unionized than those in the private colleges. When the New York State United Teachers Union (NYSUT) decided to use the CBTE issue to further its struggle to obtaining control of the teaching profession, the United University Professionals, a unit of NYSUT, actively intervened at the college level. The private colleges for the most part did not run into substantial union pressure or problems.

A final note, the CBTE mandate caused a substantial political conflict to surface. Who was to control the access and certification of the profession? Prior to the mandate the colleges and universities had the control. The mandate very

clearly sought to have that control distributed in some cooperative way between the colleges and universities and the school districts and unions. Whether or not this control has been redistributed remains to be seen. It is interesting to note that the political fighting that took place for the most part took place outside of the consortia. The consortia set about their task and with but two exceptions complied with the state mandate deadline. The political struggle for control did not hinder CBTE program development at the consortia level.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Due to the wide variety of approaches taken throughout the state in developing the CBTE format, it is necessary to standardize the following terms to insure consistencey in collection and interpretation of responses.

1. Consortium- The collective entity comprised of the agencies and institutions involved in developing the CBTE program. The consortia might include; Teachers' Unions, Community Organizations, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), School Districts, etc.

2. Policy Board- Group which coordinates and/or directs the activitites of the consortia membership as the CBTE format is developed. The Policy Board consists of representatives of the groups who participate in the Consortium.

3. Task Force- Group responsible specifically for the development of the program proposal. Task Force usually consists of members of the various organizations in the consortia who have an interest or expertise in a specific educational area. For instance, a Task Force on elementary education might consist of two faculty members from a university, three elementary school teachers, and two parents.

4. IHE- This refers to the Institution of Higher Education involved in the consortium.

5. Mandate- The provisions of Education Law #6842 and the criteria establised by the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification which outlined the competency-based requirements for program registration with the State Education Department.

6. School District- School District involved in the consortium.

7. Professional Agency- This usually refers to the Teachers' Union involved in the consortium.

8. Program Proposal- Document submitted, by the IHE and consortia, to the State Education Department for registration.

9. Program Registration- Refers to the State Education Department's decision to register a program for one year or four years.

NOTE: All programs and program proposals, forming the focal point of this study, were to be submitted to the State Education Department on or before February 1, 1975. These include:

N-6	Deaf
Speech-Hearing	Blind
Special Education	7-9

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Adelphi University
SUNY Albany
Alfred University
SUC Brockport
Dowling College
Fordham University
Ithaca College
Keuka College
Kirkland College
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman
LIU Southampton
Marymount College
Nazareth College
SUC New Paltz
SUC Potsdam
St. John's University
Syracuse University
Vassar College

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORY

Program Registration	Type of Institution	Number of Responding Institutions
1 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
4 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
1 and 4 year program registration	Public	1
	Private	1

	DEAN	TEACHER POLICY BOARD	PRINCIPAL POLICY BOARD	COLLEGE FACULTY POLICY BOARD	CHAIRPERSON POLICY BOARD	TASK CHAIRPERSON	PUBLIC SCHOOL TASK	COLLEGE TASK
1	x				x		x	x
2	x			x		x		x
3	x	x	x	x			x	
4		x	x		x	x	x	x
5	x		x			x		x
6	x		x					
7	x		x		x			
8	x		x				x	
9	x			x				
10								
11	x	x		x				
12		x						
13	x		x	x			x	x
14		x	x	x			x	x
15		x	x		x	x	x	x
16								
17	x		x					
18	x	x				x		x

Responses per Institution by Role - Decision Making

APPENDIX C

DECISION MAKING

1. Who first called Policy Board together?

   title:

2. The final decisions regarding the composition of the Policy Board were made by:

   title:

3. Decisions relating to the specific content of the CBTE programs were made by:

   title:

4. Decisions regarding the operating procedures of the consortium were made by:

   title:

5. Decisions regarding the process for final sign off on the proposal document were made by:

   title:

6. I participated in the consortium decision making process by: (Check any response which applies)

   ____a. exchanging information

   ____b. developing solutions to problems

   ____c. selecting solutions to problems

   ____d. implementing solutions to problems

   ____e. evaluating solutions to problems

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
8.	The decision making style generally followed by the consortium could be best characterized as authoritarian.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	As a member of the consortium I felt I had no power to influence decisions that were made.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	As a member of the consortium I was called upon as often as I wished to participate in decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Consortium decisions were usually made without conflict.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	The decision making style generally followed by the consortium could be best characterized as democratic.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Consortium decisions necessary to the proposal development task were clearly identified.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Consortium decisions were usually made expeditiously.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	The consortium decision making structure was not defined at all.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	The consortium decision making process was clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	In the process of making decisions, the problem was usually defined clearly before solution ideas were presented.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	In the process of making decisions, all solution ideas were presented before any were evaluated.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	In the process of making decisions, the decision makers' hidden agendas were usually identified.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	In the process of making decisions, consortium members were pressured to conform to the majority's decision.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
21.	Consortium members spent more time on maintaining the consortium than on making consortium decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Decision rules were developed by the consortium to expedite the decision making process followed by the group.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	The consortium decision making process had a feedback system built into it.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Before consortium decisions were made, members clearly identified who had the necessary information.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Before consortium decisions were made, members clearly identified what the necessary information was to resolve the problem.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D - ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

TABLE I

ANOVA TABLE - Type of registration and degree of conflict

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	15.9581	1	15.9581	12.605
Within Groups	81.0267	64	1.2660	
Total	96.9847	65		

>p.001

TABLE II

ANOVA TABLE - Type of institution and degree of conflict

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	6.9703	1	6.9703	4.956
Within Groups	90.0145	64	1.4065	
Total	96.9849	65		

>p.028

TABLE III

ANOVA TABLE - Type of institution and task identity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2.7870	1	2.7870	4.334
Within Groups	41.1524	64	0.6430	
Total	43.9394	65		

>p.039

TABLE IV

ANOVA TABLE - Type of institution and solution evaluation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F. Ratio
Between Groups	3.9720	1	3.9720	4.845
Within Groups	52.4674	64	0.8198	
Total	56.4394	65		

>p.030

TABLE V

ANOVA TABLE - Type of institutions and pressure to conform

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F. Ratio
Between Groups	2.9297	1	2.9297	4.256
Within Groups	44.0552	64	0.6884	
Total	46.9849	65		

>p.041

TABLE VI

ANOVA TABLE - Type of institution and group maintenance time

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F. Ratio
Between Groups	7.3476	1	7.3476	7.383
Within Groups	63.6836	64	0.9951	
Total	71.0303	65		

>p.008

TABLE VII

ANOVA TABLE - Type of institution and information sources

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	5.0455	1	5.0455	4.455
Within Groups	72.4848	64	1.1326	
Total	77.5303	65		

>p.037

TABLE VIII

ANOVA TABLE - Type of institution and decision relevant information

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	11.2421	1	11.2421	13.856
Within Groups	51.9245	64	0.8113	
Total	63.1667	65		

>p.001

TABLE IX

ANOVA TABLE - Size of institution and degree of conflict

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	6.6532	1	6.6532	4.714
Within Groups	90.3317	64	1.4114	
Total	96.9849	65		

>p.032

TABLE X

ANOVA TABLE - Size of institution and task identity

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	4.6007	1	4.6007	7.485
Within Groups	39.3387	64	0.6147	
Total	43.9394	65		

>p.008

TABLE XI

ANOVA TABLE - Program and clearly defined decision process

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	4.8258	2	2.4129	3.488
Within Groups	40.1250	58	o.6918	
Total	44.9508	60		

>p.036

TABLE XII

ANOVA TABLE - Program and Problem Definition

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	5.2579	2	2.6290	3.173
Within Groups	48.0536	58	0.8285	
Total	53.3115	60		

>p.048

TABLE XIII

ANOVA TABLE - Group and Authoritarian Decision Style

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	4.8876	2	2.4438	4.684
Within Groups	32.8700	63	0.5217	
Total	37.7576	65		

>p.013

TABLE XIV

ANOVA TABLE - Size of institution and participation in solution evaluation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1.6785	1	1.6785	8.073
Within Groups	13.3064	64	0.2079	
Total	14.9849	65		

>p.006